

6 AUG 2006

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

KW299PC

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002107

International filing date (day/month/year)

04.02.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

17.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

KABUSHIKI KAISHA KENWOOD

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002107

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion .

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language

_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

- a. type of material

☐

a sequence listing

☐

table(s) related to the sequence listing

- b. format of material

☐

in written format

☐

in computer readable form

- c. time of filing/furnishing

☐

contained in the international application as filed.

☐

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002107

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	2-5	YES
	Claims	1, 6, 7	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-7	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-7	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP 2003-121182 A (Ecos Research Co., Ltd.), 23 April 2003, column 21, line 8 to column 22, line 41 (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 2: JP 8-75493 A (Ecos Research Co., Ltd.), 22 March 1996, column 10, line 29 to column 11, line 45 (Family: none)</p> <p>The invention described in claim 1 does not appear to possess novelty based on document 1 cited in the ISR. The invention described in claim 1 is disclosed in column 21, line 8 to column 22, line 41 of document 1 (see the description relating to a "Route Monitoring Program". The search for a route for avoiding stagnation locations is described in Par. No. 0094).</p> <p>The invention described in claim 2 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1 and document 2 cited in the ISR. In document 1, the time computation means and judgment means are not separated in two means, but if the comparison of the arrival estimation time and arrival desired time in the route monitoring program of document 1 is taken into account, then dividing the two means will be merely a design matter for a person skilled in the art. Document 2 discloses that the passing sequence of a plurality of ground points is determined by taking into account the stagnation information.</p> <p>The invention described in claim 3 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1 and document 2 cited in the ISR. See the contents of description of Par. No. 0094 of document 1.</p> <p>The invention described in claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1 and document 2 cited in the ISR. The route monitoring program of document 1 apparently sequentially executes the condition judgment when a search is repeated.</p> <p>The invention described in claim 5 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1 and document 2 cited in the ISR. See the contents of description of Par. No. 0094 of document 1.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 6 and 7 do not appear to possess novelty based on document 1 cited in the ISR for the same reasons as described in relation to the invention described in claim 1.</p>			

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002107

Box No. VII **Certain defects in the international application**

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

The description of "sent within 10 min" in page 36, line 9 of the detailed description of the invention is apparently a typo of "delayed by 10 min".